FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Latin America

Vol VI No 073 16 April 1986

INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Peru's Garcia Addresses ALADI Meeting [Lima Television Peruana] A 1

BRAZIL

Government Issues Response to Libya Conflict D 1
Itamaraty Statement D 1
Legislators Comment D 1
Brazilians in Tripoli Uninjured D 2

PERU

Leaders Comment on U.S. Air Strike in Libya J 1
Garcia on U.S. 'Arrogance' J 1
Wagner Discusses Response J 1
Foreign Ministry Protest J 2

CENTRAL AMERICA

COSTA RICA

President Monge Comments on U.S. Attack on Libya P 1

EL SALVADOR

Vice President Views U.S. Blow to Terrorism P 1

HONDURAS

New Sandinist Incursion, Youths 'Branded' P 2
Azcona on Foreign Policy, Regional Issues [TIEMPO 15 Apr] P 3

NICARAGUA

Foreign Ministry Condemns U.S. Attack on Libya P 12
Parties Repudiate Attack P 13
Various Groups Comment P 13
Citizens Protest P 14
Approval of O'Neill Proposal Called 'Maneuver' P 14

CUBA

Reportage on U.S.-Libyan Clash, Commentary	Q 1
U.S. Policy 'State Terrorism'	Q 1
2d U.S. Air Strike Reported	Q 1
Embassy in Tripoli Undamaged	Q 1
Libyan Official: No Fear of U.S.	Q 2
Anti-Libyan Actions Reviewed	Q 2
AALAPSO Condemns Attack	Q 2
Government Statement	Q 3
3d U.S. Attack Noted	Q 4

PERU'S GARCIA ADDRESSES ALADI MEETING

PA141522 Lima Television Peruana in Spanish 0212 GMT 12 Apr 86

[Speech by President Alan Garcia to an ALADI meeting in Montevideo on 11 April -- recorded, monitored in progress]

[Text] ...and historical limitations of our economies. Some believe that in the future it will be possible to make a living from raw material exports. Others believe it is possible to defend the national industries under the banners of nationalism and independence, without realizing that only a well-integrated industry with a broader market can be successful in the future. Therefore, today we are facing the worsening of all of these problems and our only legacy has been a foreign debt that threatens the level of our salaries and the prices of the products we consume with more taxes and reserves, all of which can only have one reply. However, the experience we must gain from all of this is that our own interests and the interests of those who divide us, force us to accept bilateral transactions, and seduce us with trumpeted announcements of new financial proposals -- that are only more of the same thing and to which we must not yield -- is what keeps us divided and prevents our unity.

What can we do now to answer the question: Where is our Latin America heading or going? I am here to say that following the example of the 1924 ideology, which is one of the many concepts that were in vogue at that time and which reflects the many efforts for integration and a continental response, I am here to say that based on those historical examples we should make up our minds to act and move. We must make continental nationalism a reality. We have failed to do so. However, this cannot be done solely through manufacturing strategies, commercial exchange, and technological demands because in the long run the only loser in the endless argument of who wins and who loses is Latin America.

I have seen and I have been present at many technocratic meetings where what each one must produce, how, and when is discussed in detail. From all of this, we have only harvested a loss of time and discouraging setbacks. Who benefits from this delay? Who is or who are Latin America's enemies, and consequently who are the enemies of the Latin American democracy and peoples? Who is each one of us helping with our bilateral transactions and our selfish hope that we will move forward by ourselves? I am sure that those who will follow us will look back, perhaps ironically, at those of us who, although stating the contrary, continued to act as if we did not realize that we could not continue to be isolated and that our only path was to seek our unity. We must not seek our unity through endless negotiations alone, but through decisions and actions in view of the political situations we must confront.

We must get together, we must join desires and capabilities, and we must put them together even at the risk of failure. They must be put together. The speculative calculation that things must be done in a way that they cannot fail only shows the fear of those who do not believe in doing anything. Things must be done, even if they are not perfect. We must start somewhere. We have begun. We have initiated throughout Latin America a formidable and promising effort toward this awareness with the Contadora Group's process. The four countries that initially created the group were reinforced with the support given by other Latin American countries.

However, we have faced intransigency, a lack of understanding, and distrust. We have had to face the fact that our own words and actions have been distorted by the negative press that sometimes tries to prevent substantial messages from reaching the peoples' conscience. We have realized -- disheartened at times -- that the efforts became stagnant. However, the fact that we stayed together kept things going. We must praise the determination of the Latin American leaders who have kept their goals throughout the years without retreating.

Today President Sanguinetti and I once again agreed to send a message -- a public letter whose contents will be known after it has been sent, to the Central American presidents to urge them to show the responsibility that all of Latin America demands from them. We have agreed to this because it is publicly and internationally known that at the latest meeting in Panama a lengthy process perhaps arrived at a point of no return, at a dead end, and possibly the gradual and definite fading of the expectations that for the first time all of Latin America would show its self-determination concerning a political issue and would come between a small country and a great colossus. Definitely, all of this effort cannot be lost or given up.

Therefore, imbued with the Montevideo spirit, today we sent a message to the five Central American presidents to demand from them on behalf of Latin America that the mandate of these past months and the desires of Latin Americans not be evaded. We will have to start again and make a new effort, because we do not give up our right to be Latin Americans, and because the intransigency and fears of some are not going to make us forget that we have a fundamental mandate that has already been undertaken by the Contadora Group.

If this effort fails it will constitute proof for the unbelieving, for those who refuse to listen, and for those who are afraid. It will be proof that we do not have to get underway, that we must maintain the unity of the Contadora Group, the Support Group, and the Central American countries, and that we must conclude the negotiations and preparations of the Central American peace document. We must conclude the process -- whatever it costs -- because this process is the prior step to another greater, large-scale, truly historical process: the uniting of our wills to solve the serious foreign debt problem that compounds all of the injustices our people have experienced.

That is why today we agreed with Julio Maria Sanguinetti to make a new effort, an effort deserving of the spirit of Montevideo with determination and passion because we can neither fail nor abandon the goals of the Contadora Group. As a fundamental objective of integration, we call for the establishing of our nations' common identity. We have decided to make the forefathers of integration and national struggles a common heritage. Why shouldn't Artigas also be ours? Why shouldn't kids view all the heroes and forefathers of this country as Peruvians? Why should we think heroism has a specific nationality on our continent? Why shouldn't we view our heroes as heroes of the entire continent?

Today when I entered Government House I heard the best reception possible: the voice of children singing Peru's national anthem. They were children from the Republica de Peru school. They sang that song better, perhaps, than many Peruvians. This is important. Let's us hope that in Peru we will be able to hear the music -- with operatic intonations -- of the Uruguayan national anthem. Let's hope that Peru's young people have the capability to realize that America is one single nation. This is why we have signed an agreement that we will view our heroes and forefathers as a common heritage, that we will view our caudillos as our common heritage, and that even our contradictions -- the contradiction between the cities and the rural areas, and the contradictory interpretations of history -- are common to both nations.

We must feel like that old caudillo Uribe who said that whoever attacks one of our nations is attacking the entire continent. We must say what was said in 1847, and we must take the message of Segovia from Sandino who said that whoever attacks a Latin American country attacks flesh of our own flesh and we must respond. We must not only respond with condemnation and documents, but we must also actively respond so that our response will have the weight of sanction and so that it will be felt that as a continent we have the strength of action. We must unite our cultures and understand them as a single culture. We must link our economies, our markets, and our productive capacities. We already know all of this. But politically speaking, before the great models of technological integration are accomplished, we must unite our decisions to guarantee our sovereignty and independence.

I must express a brief thought to this audience which, professionally and vocationally, is the one most indicated. Good intentions and great decisions have been frequent on the continent. Nevertheless, we have followed what could be described as traditional paths, weak paths of integration. We have wanted to repeat different histories by following those same paths. We wanted to have free trade zones, common markets, and industrial planning. Perhaps, within those plans, the best that has been achieved has been the subregional Andean Group, which also sought to integrate industrial capacity. We have a commitment to do this, and we have placed at the service of the Andean Group all the force -- the large or small political and economic forces that Peru might have -- because it is another attempt, the most advanced attempt that cannot be turned back, that must not cease to exist. I would feel, at least during my administration, that Peru was guilty of aggression against Latin America if it did not do everything possible to maintain in force the strong, and growing Andean Group, as we also want to maintain the ALADI.

However, we believe that integration must be achieved through urgent need and through an immediate reply to the urgency. We cannot continue with gradual, traditional models that were successful in other continents but have no reason to be successful in ours. We believe that there are some crucial issues and fundamental contradictions in Latin America's political life, and that there are some decisions that demand an immediate reply before the great models of integration. How can we integrate our industries in crisis and recession? How can we integrate our populations without patience? How can we integrate our future if it involves problems that we have not solved? One of those problems, for example, is the foreign debt, which continues to mericlessly pressure our economies. How can we speak of integration if we have not made an integrationist decision because if we had, we would have resolved the most outstanding problems that exist in our political history.

Our proposal is that rather than through models or copies, integration be carried out through great decisions. This is the hour for great decisions, which are the ones that make history. The integration of the great decisions should ease the historic pressures that our people suffer and lay the foundations so that afterward our economies will draw together.

One of the first topics that must be resolved is the foreign debt. I will tirelessly repeat that it is the fundamental and historic issue that threatens to become more negatively important in our economies and societies. Some see that others are more involved and distressed by the topic of the debt, but being relatively more free of that grave problem does not mean that almost inertially it might not become more negative in the future.

I have said that the foreign debt is a homogeneous issue for all our countries and economies. Now we have the result: being debtors after being exporters and industrialists. The foreign debt is a political issue and it demands a political response and not an economic response of bilateral transactions, refinancing, or renegotiation.

Why do we continue to deceive ourselves by leaving to the immediate future what must be given a reply now? The foreign debt is a political, human, and social problem. Behind its cold figures are urgent problems of hunger, lack of industrialization, a halt to development, and an inability to resolve problems.

What are we Latin Americans going to do in view of the foreign debt? How are we going to resolve the foreign debt if we let the Contadora process regress? From here, with President Sanguinetti, we urge the Latin American rulers to further commit themselves so that this effort will not fail, so that there will be no intervention, so that there will be no support for insurrectional groups, so that the free determination of peoples will be respected, so that our continent -- Central America -- will not be turned into a testing ground and area of limited struggle for the big powers. We must make sure that the Contadora Document is successful so that with that guarantee we can launch ourselves into the great problem of the debt, launch ourselves with a sense of spirit and adventure, positively and without fear. There are costs that must be paid to respond to the grave debt problem, bit they are momentary costs, lower than the high costs we will pay if we do not provide a solution, an answer to that problem.

The second issue is that of trade, which at this time diverts to third countries what should be a more harmonious relationship in our production development. I ask myself: What have we really done aside from urgently declaring ourselves for compensated trade in our region and for intraregional trade? What have we done to complement our production and reorient its trade? What have we done to use our purchasing capacity to open new markets and to defend existing markets? I think that, on the contrary, after an encouraging takeoff of growth of intraregional trade, we now watch passively as it drops and how in a few years we have opened our economies to the traditional industrial markets as a result of which their protectionism now increasingly affects our economy. We must make a decision.

Peru's commitment at this time is to reorient our trade in order to make our production complementary with the other Latin American countries and to organize our purchasing capacity to effectively and jointly respond to those that prevent our products' access to their markets. An essential issue arises here. Just as we Peruvians struggle against the IMF and its ideas; just as we reject the doctrine imposed on our countries, the doctrine of retraction, recession, and indebtedness; just as we do not believe in the use of a single world currency because regardless of where we stand politically, even those who proclaim to be conservatives, we would have to admit that it is the most dramatic injustice of the world monetary order for a single country to be the source of liquidity for the entire world. Just as we struggle on the foreign debt issue, we have to struggle against a second great adversary of our integration and our development, and that is the GATT.

GATT has functioned due to what we in Peru call the law of the funnel. It applies restrictions on those of us who do not have economic power and opens possibilities for those who are the owners of the world and its trade. Markets are restricted and closed to use because we have protected our industrial development, because we have tax refunds for exporters. Markets are closed to textile products. Markets are closed to bottled and canned products. On the other hand, they open, through the force of low prices, which is the equivalent of the force of their cannons, our markets to their agricultural and livestock products thanks to subsidies that are not prohibited by that legislation.

We have to seek equivalency in world trade and achieve respect for our condition due to a differential right that is not theirs. There are no rights in equality. There are rights in each particular time of our societies. They, developed and enjoying well-being, do not have the right that we have to the opening of opportunities for our development because the equal and common right of human beings is that all have the same well-being and the same possibility.

Those of us who have less development and those of us who suffer from the asymmetry of world trade have greater right to make our voice be heard and to have the trade and tariff agreements respected. That is why, this morning with President Sanguinetti, instead of signing a generalized agreement, we wanted to specifically discuss what we are going to do so that this visit, in addition to awakening brotherhood and affection between Uruguay and Peru, will also have a concrete result. We discussed what we should do, whether to leave to subsequent commissions the development of our trade or to directly face as rulers the problems and at least propose concrete examples that will serve as a basis for the expansion of our bilateral trade? As a result, we discussed, not great declarations, but in the most ordinary and common way, livestock problems, specific economic problems. I want for Peru the repopulation of the Andes with wool-bearing livestock and food stock. Uruguay has it. On the other hand, we have petroleum and copper that are not traded with Uruguay. We have a surplus of iron in Peru just as there is a surplus in the number of head of wool-bearing livestock here.

This morning we took the first step by establishing trade links that will integrate those products. I would not have been happy if I left Uruguay leaving only good memories or what you, Mr President, call integrationist poetry. Integration must also be achieved on the basis of great decisions such as that of the debt or on the basis of small decisions such as the wool-bearing livestock and petroleum. However, the important thing is to make a decision. It might be that they are not the most perfect or exact, but I would not have been happy to leave Uruguay without leaving something that symbolizes that it is possible, that we are capable.

Therefore, we have to integrate our trade and our economies, and we must do so in the forthcoming struggle in the GATT. For this purpose, Uruguay and Peru are proposing and calling for a prior meeting of SELA to discuss those topics and the price of the raw materials and basic products so that we will go with a Latin American consensus to such a meeting that so many times has frustrated our expectations. We have to integrate our economies with little things and with the trade agreement that we signed with Uruguay this morning.

We must make a decision -- and that is Peru's commitment -- to reorient our economies among us. Perhaps this will mean a momentary loss. Perhaps some will ask: Why should we buy from Uruguay at a price that is $2, $5 or $10 higher? Because that is the cost of integration.

I act as a Latin American ruler to make my people understand that they must pay for their destiny and their future. I cannot look at just the immediate need and say that I am going to buy cheaper powdered milk from France or New Zealand because it is $20 cheaper than the price per ton that Uruguay sells us. I cannot just look at immediate needs and demagogically tell my people and the urban masses -- that many times subordinate and dominate their politicians -- that I am going to buy French or New Zealand meat because it is cheaper than what Uruguay can sell us. That would mean a betrayal of the integrationist spirit. In the last few years we have lost billions of dollars in debts, in interest rates, we have lost tens of billions paying inflated prices for technology. Why can we not lose $20 a ton so Uruguay can have a market for its surplus meat, its wool-bearing livestock, and milk if in exchange we will have much more integrated economies in the future?

Each of us must also pay for the future of the brother next to us. That is what we rulers of Latin America do not understand. We complain about GATT. We speak ill of all the monetary and trade systems, but in practice we sometime succumb to the immediate needs of those who demand lower prices and then we forget that perhaps by paying slightly higher prices we encourage real integration of our economies because we will create not only gratitude but, in production what must be the establishment of a more integrated and productive America.

That is why I believe we must act. Integration must be carried out on the basis of decisions. Someone asks me: Why should we pay more for milk, for livestock or meat? I have a responsibility as a leader. I was not elected in Peru solely to lower prices in the first year of my administration. I was elected to do something historic, and I expect and demand from all rulers that same historic concept. We are betting on what might be more costly in the immediate future but it is what will lead to the achievement of something that is not the cheapest but the greatest thing in history and that is integration.

For this reason, we must also support what we call balance of payments or commercial balance. We have spoken much about procedures or institutions to support our reserves, yet we do not dare strengthen the institutions that, as the Andean Reserve Fund, have demonstrated in Latin America that they are more vigorous and stronger than the IMF itself; and this without the IMF's terms imposed on our economies for world political reasons.

I met with President Raul Alfonsin a few days ago. We agreed to develop, with Argentina or with the Andean Reserve Fund, a mechanism to support our balance of payments to make our continental entity stronger. For this, we must create a currency of Latin American account unit to free our trade from its dependency on U.S. currency. Since its linkage to gold was ended in the 1970's, this currency has no reason to continue enjoying the privilege of being a world currency.

It is indispensable to broaden current facilities for financing of intraregional commerce, encourage trade, and prevent the intervention of foreign banks that profit from our payments. I feel that the time has arrived to assume integration as a process in agreement with our peoples' political and economic life, turn it into a myth for the multitudes, to make the university masses, the illusioned youths, the working masses, and also the peasants speak about and feel integration as a requirement through education by our politicians.

They long for justice. It is our duty to make them understand that integration is their best instrument. For this, we will think big, we will think generously and with a vision of the future.

For dozens of years, our peoples have demanded more and more unity, and we cannot disappoint them. For this, speaking about democracy, I reiterate that we can do it only by speaking about integration. If the forerunners of our independence served their fatherland as they did America, we could turn this vision into a reality.

I must confess that I am sometimes discouraged to see that our America, which has become associated with the Contadora Group in the defense of its political sovereignty, still has not been able to develop a system to ensure a growing flow of goods, services, capital and even people. Latin America identified with Argentina in the Malvinas war and, more recently, the Contadora Group.

We still, however, require a strong economic impetus and will. Within this perspective, I must stress the important role as catalyst for a common awareness played by the Cartagena consensus. Through this mechanism, we, in the region's most deeply indebted countries, have taken up a common stance in the defense of our sovereign rights for our development. Peru's stance of allocated only 10 percent of our export revenues to debt servicing occurs in the Cartagena Consensus' principles and recommendations. This is another clear example of a political integration policy in the most serious economic problem.

I also want to say that the adversaries of our integration and our determination disseminate negative and improper reports about the Peruvian decision. We have not fallen into any passionate fit. We do know, however, that during our history a path has been imposed on us by the pressure of those who could apply it. We now say that our debt liabilities offer the best pressure point we have ever had in our history. And we must apply it. Otherwise, we will take a lot and negotiate a lot, but we can be sure, as in the past 50 years, that the future will tell us where we were led by our refusal to apply the pressure that we had at our disposal.

Every compelling action should be met with a compelling reaction. This is the only way we will make ourselves respected. The rationality of the world financial system is the rationality of profit. This can be understood and it is its logic. This cannot be morally condemned. It must be economically resisted. We cannot give only romantic answers to the debt. We should not expect the problems of the debt to correct themselves. Bank accounts do not correct themselves. The anonymous depositors' desire for interest does not correct itself either. A political answer is necessary and this depends on our ability to apply pressure. I wonder what would have happened had Latin America years ago allocated a large amount of its exports to the payment of the debt, if such important countries as Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Mexico had taken the exemplary step that we of the smaller and less economically powerful countries expected.

I am sure the world would have understood that Latin America had awakened and the sleeping giant had risen. I am sure the interest would not have amounted to so much as it does now and the terms would not be so pressing, nor would there be an IMF to make us pass through the ring of terms. I am sure the situation would be different. This is what we have sought. Peru's determination means taking some risks. Of course, we must take them. Only by taking risks in history made. To gamble with the certainty of a winner is not to make history. It is to make oneself a little subject to circumstances. We are subject to circumstances. We have been driven into situations. Our decision does not mean that we have attained absolute freedom. We are also dominated. But we say what we want to do. I am sure we will do it. Even if we cannot achieve it immediately, I am sure time and perseverance will help us. Time works for Latin America and its history. Time prods us toward unity. Time will show we were right, as it showed those who participated in our process of independence.

I cannot conclude, Mr President, without expressing a specific hope, also related to a percentage. I hope that the general round of negotiations that this organization has just opened can be seen as a bet for the future of integration. Perhaps it will be proposed in this round of negotiations that its results adopt the necessary mechanisms so that, before the end of this decade, the ALADI member countries succeed in making at least 40 percent of their imports be from the region.

I would also ask the association's secretary to make a study about the measures that should be taken for this goal, so at the end of the decade 40 percent of our imports come from Latin America. In this way, we will be able to overcome the deficit and succeed in making our integration process as promising as the ties we have established in Contadora and Cartagena. Mr President, upon visiting this important institution, I have reiterated the importance that integration clears its way little by little for the Peruvian president due to his political ideology and for our people.

It is up to us to encourage those who work as representatives in this institution to strengthen the integration process on crucial matters.

With these purposes and proposals, which are not the result of a circumstantial need or an immediate need for support for Peru, but result from a full-fledged philosophy of justice based on political and economic emancipation of integration, I hail the permanent representatives to this organization. And through them, I hail their governments, friendly governments, reiterating and ratifying our identification with the unchanging principles of integration of the greater homeland and our decision as Peruvians to devote ourselves entirely, in our actions and words, to the service of the cause that the liberators legated to us as a message and that history itself demands from us to rescue our peoples for justice and the future. Thank you. [applause]

GOVERNMENT ISSUES RESPONSE TO LIBYA CONFLICT

Itamaraty Statement

PY152234 Brasilia Domestic Service in Portuguese 2223 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] This evening Itamaraty disclosed the Brazilian Government's official stance regarding the U.S.-Libyan conflict. The note stated: The Brazilian Government is seriously concerned about the developments in the Mediterranean area. Brazil has always advocated the need to solve international conflicts through peaceful means. The international community has the adequate legal tools and political forums to handle controversies. True and lasting peace can only be based on the solid ground of law and diplomacy. Therefore, the Brazilian Government regrets the use of violence, which is not the appropriate means to solve disagreements. The growing spiral of mutual attacks to which the crisis in the Mediterranean zone may lead will have serious consequences for international coexistence. The Brazilian Government voices its hopes that moderation and equilibrium will prevail in the conflict between the United States and Libya and that the cause of peace will be preserved and the lives of innocent people spared.

Legislators Comment

PY160107 Brasilia Domestic Service in Portuguese 2240 GMT 15 Apr 86

[From the Congressional Report]

[Excerpt] Speaking for the PMDB [Brazilian Democratic Movement Party] leadership, Deputy Maurilio Ferreira Lima reasserted the Brazilian Government's position regarding the conflict between the United States and Libya by repudiating the use of force to solve international issues. The legislator noted that Brazil upholds the noninterference in the domestic affairs of other countries and that the United Nations is the proper forum to solve disputes.

Speaking for the PDT [Democratic Workers Party], Deputy Jacques d'Ornella expressed his party's indignation over the belligerent U.S. action which he believes poses a threat to world peace. The PDT deputy expressed solidarity with the Libyan people by noting that nothing justifies the bombing of civilian populations.

Speaking for the PTB [Brazilian Labor Party], Deputy Roberto Jefferson said that the problem between Reagan and Al-Qadhdhafi cannot continue because the well-being of the entire human race is at stake. The legislator condemned the U.S. attitude and criticized Libyan actions by noting that although the belligerent U.S. action is not justified, neither is the terrorist policy promoted by Libya.

Leader of the Comunist Party of Brazil (Aroldo Lima) protested the U.S. military attack against Libyaa and the British Government's support for this belligerent action by noting that the Brazilian Government must express its support for the principle of self-determination of all peoples and call its ambassador to the United States for consultations. Commenting on the U.S. attack against Libya, Deputy Aldo Arantes urged the Brazilian Government to repudiate this military aggression and reassert its support for the principle of nonintervention and the self-determination of nations.

Jacques d'Ornella repudiated the U.S. attack against Libya and suggested that the Brazilian Foreign Ministry should request the recall of its ambassador to Washington as well as start negotiations for the return of the U.S. Embassy [as heard] to its country. Joao (Marquez) expressed his hope that the Brazilian Government will publicly condemn the U.S. aggression against Libya by requesting the United Nations to make a decision in this regard. In keeping with his position as president of the Brazilian-Arab Friendship Cooperation League, Aroldo Sanford, repudiated the attack perpetrated by U.S. forces against Libya.

Moreover, Deputy Cristina Tavares condemned the U.S. attack against Libya and appealed to the Brazilian Government to immediately express its protest against the arrogant attitude of U.S. President Ronald Reagan. According to the deputy, the international situation is quite serious and the U.S. offensive in reprisal for the Libyan bombing may be the beginning of world war III which will certainly lead to a holocaust.

The bombing of Tripoli and Bengazi in Libya which was perpetrated last night by the U.S. military forces was repudiated today in a vehement speech by Senator Fabio Lucena. After noting that he was speaking for himself, for the people of Amazonas and for the majority of Brazilians, Fabio Lucena described the U.S. bombing against Libya as an inhuman, cruel and genocidal act.

Senator Lucena believes that the fact that the chief of the Libyan Government, Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, is an admitted terrorist does not justify the actions promoted by U.S. President Ronald Reagan. Fabio Lucena also regretted the attitude adopted by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher for allowing U.S. planes to lift off from British territory to attack Libya.

The speech delivered by Senator Jamil Haddad Adad was along the same line. Speaking for the Brazilian Socialist Party, Senator Haddad condemned the attitude adopted by both Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. Senator Fabio Lucena warned that the U.S. attitude may be the fuse needed to start a nuclear war in which the entire human race will be sacrificed. He also noted that he is confident that President Jose Sarney's administration will severly condemn the belligerent U.S. actions.

Brazilians in Tripoli Uninjured

PY152246 Brasilia Domestic Service in Portuguese 2220 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] The U.S. attacks on Tripoli yesterday and this afternoon [as heard] did not affect any of the 30 Brazilian citizens living in that city. This information was disclosed by Brazilian Ambassador to Libya Tarcisio Mariano da Rocha during a telephone call today. He said that the building where the Brazilian Embassy is located is not in the area that the United States bombed and that no decision has been made so far to evacuate the Brazilians living in Tripoli.

[Begin Da Rocha recording] It is a small community of approximately 30 people, including the Brazilians assigned to the embassy. The embassy is ok. nothing happened around the embassy. [end recording]

LEADERS COMMENT ON U.S. AIR STRIKE IN LIBYA

Garcia on U.S. 'Arrogance'

PY151447 Paris AFP in Spanish 1433 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] Lima, 15 Apr (AFP) -- Peruvian President Alan Garcia has stated that the U.S. attack on Libya is an attitude born out of arrogance. According to the Lima newspaper HOY, Garcia last night said: I believe that this is the arrogance of military technology. The Peruvian Government has not yet officially reacted to the conflictive Libyan situation.

Wagner Discusses Response

PY151926 Lima Radioprogramas del Peru in Spanish 1300 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Interview with Peruvian Foreign Minister Alan Wagner by Denis Vargas Marin during the "Ampliacion de Noticias" program]

[Vargas Marin] Good morning, friends. In the biggest air raid since the Vietnam war, 33 U.S. bombers under the cover of night on 14 April launched a [words indistinct] against Libya, despite the opposition from its European allies. The U.S. planes thus seriously endangered the Libyan people by attacking Tripoli and Benghazi. International commentators are saying that world peace is at stake. We will now talk about this subject with Peruvian Foreign Minister Allan Wagner. Good morning, Dr Allan Wagner.

[Wagner] Good morning, Denis. Nice to talk to you.

[Vargas Marin] Nice to talk to you, Dr Wagner. First we would like to know the Peruvian position toward this new U.S. attack against Libya.

[Wagner] As you know, we strictly abide by the principles of international law, which are outlined in the UN Charter. The UN Charter proscribes the use of force or the threat to use force in international relations, and advocates the peaceful settlement of conflicts. Therefore, we cannot support any measure that opposes these principles; that is, we believe that any such action violated international law and certainly harms coexistence and world peace and security. And when I say any measure, I am not only referring to the fact that the United States is taking the law into its own hands, but also to the acts of state terrorism that some countries are performing.

In the specific case of Libya, it is common knowledge that Colonel al-Qadhdhafi announced that he would take revenge because of the presence of the U.S. fleet in the Gulf of Sidra through terrorist actions in several places of the world. Therefore, terrorism is an international crime which, despite any justification, remains a crime. Violence cannot be met with violence, but by resorting to international law. We believe that the path should not be to take the law into one's own hands, but to resort to the existing international forums, like the UN Security Council, to settle this type of situation. The UN Security Council has powers to efficiently deal with any international situation.

For countries like Peru, which is relatively small at the world level, it is essential to permanently uphold international law, proscribing the use of force or the threat to use force in international relations, and to advocate the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

[Vargas Marin] Dr Wagner, will an official comminque be issued on the Peruvian position which you have just outlined in disagreement with this type of attack, because violence cannot be met with violence?

[Wagner] Yes, of course. We are analyzing the events and we will issue a statement in due time.

[Unidentified reporter] Good morning, Dr Wagner. Yugoslavia has called for a special meeting of foreign ministers of the Nonaligned Movment in New Delhi to analyze the situation in the wake of the U.S. raid on two Libyan cities. Will Peru attend this meeting? It has also been said that a document that condemns the United States and that conveys full support for Libya is under preparation.

[Wagner] Well, it is clear that Peru will attend any meeting called to analyze this subject. I believe the information you are referring to may have some inaccuracies. The Coordinating Bureau of the nonaligned countries is now meeting in New Delhi. Yugoslavia must be asking that the subject be considered at the ongoing Coordinating Bureau meeting. It is presided over by Deputy Foreign Minister (Hoover Villand). Our delegation also includes our ambassador to the United Nations. Therefore, we will maintain close contact with our delegation to see how the issue will be analyzed at the meeting. Obviously, the instructions that I will give will be in agreement with what I have just said; that is, our position will remain faithful to our principles.

[Reporter] Changing subjects, Mr Minister, yesterday Peru deposited $30 million, as the nation's president had announced, in payment of interest on its foreign debt. With your vision on the foreign area and making a political analysis, what could you say about this?

[Wagner] Well, Minister Alva Castro has made some very important and detailed statements on what happened yesterday at the IMF directorate. It is important to stress the fact that the countries that are members of the IMF directorate have supported the Peruvian position, recognizing that a developing country like Peru is unable to pay more than what its development needs permit. So, I think this measure taken yesterday by the IMF directorate is a step forward, although it does not guarantee that Peru could not in the future be declared ineligible by the Directorate. We will see what happens later, but I believe that we have made progress on the international stage, with firm steps that are vindicating the Peruvian position.

[Vargas Marin] Well, Dr Allan Wagner, we thank you for participating in Ampliacion de Noticias, as you always do.

[Wagner] It was my pleasure. I'll see you.

Foreign Ministry Protest

PY160206 Paris AFP in Spanish 0140 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] Lima, 15 Apr (AFP) -- Peru tonight issued its official protest against the air raid that the United States launched against Libya last night on the grounds that it goes against the rules and regulations for international coexistence. The Peruvian Foreign Ministry issued a statement condemning all forms of terrorism irrespective of perpetrators and motives. The statement expressly stated that it refers to the attack which U.S. military planes carried out last night against Libyan cities and facilities, after the United States accused that country of carrying out terrorist attacks. The statement added that Peru rejects the actions of any state that strays from the rules and regulations for international coexistence established in the multilateral international system represented by the United Nations, which is the only means to ensure civilized coexistence between the states.

COSTA RICA

PRESIDENT MONGE COMMENTS ON U.S. ATTACK ON LIBYA

PA160225 San Jose Radio Reloj in Spanish 0100 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] President Luis Alberto Monge Alvarez described Ronald Reagan's decision to bomb the Libyan capital yesterday as serious. He refused to state if Reagan did the right thing or not, but said that although it is not known if the European nations will support him, it was a sovereign decision.

It is the president's opinion that Reagan must decide if this is the best method to erradicate terrorism. President Monge said that the bombing of Libya is another element of tension, and everyone should be alert to prevent greater consequences. He said that Costa Rica is definitely against terrorism, and that every country -- according to its possibilities and means -- should try to erradicate it. In this regard Monge said that the U.S. attack damaged terrorist bases and military installations, according to reports broadcast from Libya. The United States and any other country has the right to defend itself from this danger, President Monge said.

President Monge pointed out that he trusts the United States will not attack Nicaragua. He said that Washington has said on many occasions that it is not planning to send U.S. troops to Nicaragua. Finally, Monge Alvarez said that he does not believe the world is on the verge of a third world war.

EL SALVADOR

VICE PRESIDENT VIEWS U.S. BLOW TO TERRORISM

PA152227 San Salvador Radio Cadena YSKL in Spanish 1800 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Interview with Rodolfo Castillo Claramount, vice president and foreign minister, by Rosi Castillo on 15 April; place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Castillo Claramount] Look, there is no doubt that this action [U.S. attack on Libya] has left its mark throughout the world; it has evidently left its mark on us as well. Basically, we are trying to conciliate a war action of this nature with an action that can be argued as punitive against the Libyan Government of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, which has clearly -- and according to world public opinion and to news services from around the world -- in the past few years been a bastion for terrorism at the international level; a government that has promoted and is promoting terrorism as a new war strategy in the world. I am not saying this lightly. We only need to listen to and review the statements of Al-Qadhdhafi himself, who has threatened and claimed responsibility for terrorist acts that have rocked the world. Let us not forget the massacres at the Rome airport, that is the Leonardo Da Vinci Airport in Fiumicino, and the Vienna airport, where passengers waiting to board their flights were massacred with impunity. Added to this the recent attack on the TWA plane, and the attack that destroyed the Mexicana de Aviacion or Aeromexico, I am not sure, airplane, in which 176 [as heard] persons were killed, and for which Libyan terrorist organizations, sponsored, financed, and politically tolerated by the government of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi in Libya claimed responsibility. These acts of terrorism, or of harboring terrorism, or supporting terrorism as a new method of war in the world or as a method of subjugating or forcing governments, are condemned by all countries in the world.

So, the U.S. decision claims to be a punitive strike against the sources that generate, tolerate, and further worldwide terrorism. (?We have not been totally rid of terrorism). There are proven ties between Salvadoran terrorist groups and Libya, which includes training Salvadoran terrorist groups in Libya and financing and support for Salvadoran terrorists in Libya. Therefore, even we have been touched by Mu'ammar Qadhdhafi's irresponsible and reckless stance. The U.S. action comes in the midst of all this. To be able to evaluate and assess and then comment on the U.S. action of last night, Salvadoran time, we must review it and understand it within the framework I have mentioned without going into all the details, I mean, within a much broader framework. This is not merely a whim by a superpower over a seemingly weak country -- which in fact it is not. Apparently, the United States also sustained damage during this action. To understand this isutation, there is no doubt [changes thought]...I am not going to condemn or hail it. I am simply making a historical recap of what has happened, and [words indistinct] within that much broader framework which we must use to understand the current events.

[Rosi Castillo] Do you think that this incident could have an impact on Central America?

[Castillo Claramount] Regretfully, that is possible. (?There are) some suspicions. In Honduras, there have been some comments along those lines. Here, in El Salvador, there have been past actions sponsored by the Al-Qadhdhafi government. I wholeheartedly hope that violence and terrorism will not increase in the country, as a result of actions sponsored by that government. Look at this, he [Qadhdhafi] has stated it very clearly. He has said that he is going to wage a terrorist war all over the world, and that everything for him is a military objective, or a terrorist objective. He does not care if this means a hospital, a children's school, the life of an official, or anything. Proof of this is when a bomb is placed inside a plane carrying hundreds of people; we must take into consideration how reckless it is to kill people regardless of who they are. These are the facts in all the incidents facing the world today. [end recording]

HONDURAS

NEW SANDINIST INCURSION, YOUTHS 'BRANDED'

PA151452 Tegucigalpa Cadena Audio Video in Spanish 1155 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] We now have an exclusive report from our correspondent Juan Ramon Aguilera Z., on a new Sandinist incursion into Honduran territory that occurred yesterday. EPS troops crossed onto Honduran soil and captured several compatriots. Three Hondurans suffered the humiliation of being branded with the initials FSLN with a marking iron, as if they were animals. Here is a report on this by Juan Ramon Aguilera Z., our correspondent in Choluteca. Go ahead, Aguilera Z. from Choluteca.

[Begin relay] Good morning this is a report from Choluteca for Cadena Audio Video. Once again, Sandinists entered Honduran territory, and marked the initials FSLN on two Hondurans with a hot marking iron.

Yesterday afternoon, a group of well-armed Sandinists entered 1 1/2 km inside Honduran territory, in a village near San Marcos de Colon, specifically in a cattle farm, and using a hot marking iron, engraved the FSLN initials on the innter part of the forearm of two Honduran youths, who are 10 and 18 years old respectively.

The incident caused great surprise, as only in the medieval times were slaves marked.

Ten cattlemen took them to Tegucigalpa to show them to the Armed Forces staff, showing the dreadful situation of our people at the border. Horror prevails in this sector, as never before had humans been marked in the 20th century, as the Sandinists -- who have lost all respect for us -- have done.

AZCONA ON FOREIGN POLICY, REGIONAL ISSUES

PA151637 San Pedro Sula TIEMPO in Spanish 15 Apr 86 pp 8, 9

[Interview with President Jose Azcona Hoyo by "two European reporters" -- date and place not given]

[Text] Tegucigalpa -- "The Sandinists should bug off [no jodan los Sandinistas] and take care of themselves," President Jose Azcona Hoyo said when referring to the reports that the Army is not doing anything to evict the contras from the national territory they are occupying along the border with Nicaragua.

Azcona Hoyo was interviewed by two European reporters. He admitted that he agrees with his predecessor, Roberto Suazo Cordova, concerning foreign policy. Azcona Hoyo emphasized several times that the Central American conflict will be resolved when President Daniel Ortega decides to talk with the opposition. He advised the reporters to convince Ortega that he can save Nicaragua by speaking with the contras.

"He (Ortega) should not be dreaming, thinking that he will be able to consolidate a Marxist revolution in Nicaragua," he warned. The full test of his conversation with the European reporters is as follows:

Reporter: What is the Honduran stand concerning the U.S.-Nicaraguan conflict?

Azcona: We want a political solution to the Nicaraguan conflict. We think that the final decision on this is in the hands of the Nicaraguan Government. It should respect the commitments it has with the OAS, and should give freedom to the Nicaraguan people. We are sure that if the Nicaraguan Government adopts these decisions it will not be difficult to achieve the pacification of Nicaragua. They should talk with the armed opposition as well as the unarmed opposition. They should promise true elections.

Reporter: Would you describe this Honduran position as neutral?

Azcona: I would say that Honduras is neutral, but we always harbor the hope that the Nicaraguan problem will be solved through a democratic solution.

Reporter: It is said that the most recent Contadora meeting was a failure due to the Nicaraguan attitude that seeks a commitment from the United States that it will not continue supporting the contras following the signing of a document. Do you not understand Nicaragua's stand?

Azcona: I believe that Nicaragua should honor its commitment with the OAS, that is, giving full freedom to its people and seeking a solution to the Nicaraguan problem so that it will lead to a truly democratic system. If this should happen, there is nothing the United States can do, and I do not think it would do anything against the Nicaraguan Government.

If they insist on upholding their determination to lead Nicaragua to a totalitarian system, I think the United States will not give up in its endeavor to oust [botar] this government. Why should we calmly think that the United States is afraid that this type of government can continue to grow in the hemisphere until it reaches its own border? Then, in a reaction that might even be considered logical, it will struggle so that this may not happen.

Reporter: But would Honduras be willing to convince the United States not to continue supporting the FDN if Nicaragua fulfills the conditions stipulated in the Contadora Document?

Azcona: The United States supports that position. It has clearly stated: If Nicaragua fulfills the commitment it made to the OAS, which is practically the same as what is being established in the Contadora Document with the addition of calling for a halt to the arms buildup, the reduction of military advisers, etcetera, the United States would accept that situation.

Let the Nicaraguan people decide internally if they agree with the Sandinist system or if they are against that system. However, this should be done in full freedom and not like in the past elections where the FSLN had to win.

Reporter: Now then, I understand that in the United States there are various sectors. Would you as a liberal feel closer to the sector that is opposed to the President, that of the Democratic Party? Are you in favor or against the $100 million for the contras?

Azcona: I think that it is more advisable for Honduras that the $100 million be approved. However, what Honduras thinks at this time is not important. What is important is what will happen if the $100 million is granted or if it is not granted. I do not think President Reagan will stop presssuring Nicaragua because the $100 million is rejected. I think the pressure is going to continue because he has clearly stated this. I repeat: The solution to the Nicaraguan problem is in the hands of the Nicaraguans and no one else.

Reporter: But if it is believed that this pressure could be military and in view of the geographic situation, the aid to the contras would have to pass through Honduras.

Azcona: Not necessarily.

Reporter: Then through where?

Azcona: There are many ways. The latest aid has come from other places. It has not passed through Honduras. There can be flights from any other Central American country or even from the United States.

Reporter: President Daniel Ortega said in a press conference that there is a type of no-man's-land. Do you agree with this?

Azcona: No. We do not accept that. No way. A no-man's land does not exist in Honduras. In Honduras, all the zones are under Honduran sovereignty. That is not true. We reject that. What exists is an extensive zone on the border that is quite uninhabited and through which the counterrevolutionaries enter Nicaragua and cross to Honduras.

It is very hard for Honduras, which does not have a large Army, to guard all of the border which is approximately 700 km long by placing border posts, let us say, every 50 or 100 meters because that falls outside all our economic capacity. We would have to double the number of our troops. Just to guard that border we would need all the Armed Forces that we currently have.

Reporter: Although in the last conflict the exact location of specific contra camps was demonstrated, wouldn't it be possible, through political or military measures, to exert pressure so that at least they will leave?

Azcona: Well, what the contras want is to go to Nicaragua. That is what the contras want. The contras do not want to be here in Honduras. They want to go to Nicaragua and in fact they do go to Nicaragua but return later. As I said, we would have to have a large Army protecting the Sandinists' rearguard. I do not think they are going to protect our rearguard when they consolidate themselves. I do not think they are going to prevent the entrance into Honduras of subversive elements.

Reporter: Then are you denying the reports by former FDN members that there is some cooperation -- even close cooperation -- between the Honduran Army and the contras?

Azcona: That is not true. We know that the contras come in and out of Honduras, but we will not have our Army face a situation like that.

Reporter: Is it also false that the Honduran Army has virtually let the contras take control over a portion of the border area?

Azcona: That is not true.

Reporter: Can you visualize, Mr President, the possibility of peaceful coexistence between two countries with different ideologies, namely, Nicaragua and Honduras?

Azcona: On our part there can be coexistence. I ask you: Is there any place in the world where Marxism has not made attempts to extend its reach?

Reporter: I am from Austria. The so-called Iron Curtain is 60 km from our capital. This does not create border conflicts. Why do we allow others to support a country that is not ours?

Azcona: Perhaps as a result of the level of maturity those countries have attained -- and Hungary, which is peculiar within the Iron Curtain countries -- with a little more humanity, it could be. However, there we have the example of Berlin. Honduras does not have the capacity to receive hundreds of thousands of Nicaraguans as refugees. To the extent that the pressure on the Nicaraguan people increases and Nicaragua consolidates itself further, more refugees will come to Honduras. That is a very serious problem for us.

Reporter: For many years, and traditionally, Honduras has been governed by the military. I suppose there are institutions in which the Armed Forces still intervene politically. Do you feel pressured by the military?

Azcona: Absolutely not. There is no pressure. The relations are excellent. What the Armed Forces have done has been in consultation with the Presidency of the Republic.

Reporter: How do you explain that over the past several weeks there were numerous reports on developments in Honduras that originated in the United States, while in Honduras there were only comments and not direct information?

Azcona: We wanted to maintain control over the information so as not to alarm the population. The United States released a letter I sent to President Reagan. That is a way of proceeding over there. We did not want to alarm the population by exaggerating the problems. That is why we appeared on television to explain how everything happened and to say everything was under control. We said we requested help from the United States. That help will have to be requested as often as it is necessary because Honduras does not have many resources to spend on that kind of operation.

Reporter: Would you use the opportunity to get the United States to increase its economic assistance?

Azcona: We will not blackmail the United States. It is clear that they are helping us and will continue to help us. However, we will not take advantage of this situation. We are not offering our territory as a springboard for an invasion against Nicaragua, nor do I believe the United States is planning to invade Nicaragua. If the United States wants to invade Nicaragua there are two beaches it can use for that.

Reporter: What good is it to have U.S. troops in Honduras?

Azcona: I would say the same good it does to have U.S. troops in Spain, or at the naval base in Greece, or in Austria; I do not know if there are any in West Germany. We have treaties with the United States, and besides there are not that many troops here.

Reporter: Was there political tension between Honduras and the United States following the statements made by Secretaries Shultz and Weinberger that Honduras will support the contras?

Azcona: No, there was not a great deal of tension. We did not like the statements very much because there was much truth in them; however, not everything that was said was true. There was no tension.

Reporter: Did your government answer the U.S. request to explain the statements made by an alleged high-ranking government official who reportedly said there were pressures to state there had been an invasion?

Azcona: As far as I am concerned, no one has asked me to explain. Perhaps the press, because I have not been able to identify them. [sentence as published] Perhaps it was a person who identified himself as a high-ranking official without really being one. The United States has not asked me for any explanations. The trouble is that there is a yellow press there, and the press exaggerates any statement made by anyone concerning these issues. Maybe a fool tried to make himself important by saying he was a person close to the president of Honduras. They have neither asked for explanations, nor have I given any.

Reporter: Are there some sectors, such as labor unions and congressmen, claiming the president is not active in politics? It is said that the congress president makes more statements than he. What do you have to say about that?

Azcona: I let the people talk, because this is a democratic country. The president of the Republic is the official voice of the government, and not the foreign minister or the National Congress. Concerning the fact that I do not participate in partisan politicking, I think it is my duty as president of Honduras to be the president of all Hondurans. If I become openly involved in politicking, it would then be said that I am wasting my time by politicking. It is very difficult to please everyone. Of course, I am abreast of what is happening within my party, and I am going to support the candidate of my party. However, I will support my party's candidate without undermining or making use of my power for him to become the president. Meanwhile, I do not think it is the duty of a president to engage in politicking every day.

Reporter: As for the meeting that is being planned in Guatemala, will Honduras present a stand that might be the stand of the entire area for solving the conflict?

Azcona: I think that the position will be the same one that we had at the last Contadora meeting: conciliatory, broad, democratic, liberal; striving to reach a solution to the Central American problem.

Reporter: In other words, you do not think that what Contadora has not been able to reach will not be reached?

Azcona: I think not, because it depends on Nicaragua's position. That is where the problem lies. If Nicaragua wants to reach an understanding among the Nicaraguans... I think that it is very easy for them to achieve it, just as we Honduran are doing. Why are there no contras in Honduras? Why are there no refugees in any country in the world? Why are there no political prisoners? Why do reporters say what they wish in Honduras? Why does television and radio report what they want and no one bothers them? [paragraph as heard]

Reporter: Speaking of political prisoners and missing persons, there was a report by the Army. Do you think that report is satisfactory? What will the government do to investigate the 131 cases plus 8 others that were reported last year, plus a few other cases. There has been a charge regarding the disappearance of a labor leader.

Azcona: It seems as if a labor leader in Bajo Aguan disappeared and later reappeared. In other words, there have not been any missing persons in the past few days. In the other cases, there is a report by a high commission that was appointed by the government. They submitted a report, and we have it here, and the truth is that it does not say much.

It is not too easy to determine, in fact, I do not think that all of those persons have disappeared. Many of those persons must be abroad; it may be that others have disappeared, but we are going to try not to have missing persons during this administration.

Reporter: In other words, you want to play the role of Alfonsin.

Azcona: The situation is quite different; it is not playing the role of Alfonsin because the situation in Honduras is not the situation that prevailed in Argentina with an extraordinarily repressive government. I think we had missing persons here, unfortunately, but I do not think that Alfonsin will clarify all the cases of missing persons.

Reporter: If the conditions were given would you be opposed to the return of Mr Gustavo Alvarez?

Azcona: According to our Constitution, no one can be expatriated from the country. General Gustavo Alvarez can return to Honduras the day he chooses. If he has any legal affairs pending, he will have to respond to the tribunals. However, our Constitution prohibits the forceful expatriation of any Honduran; our Constitution does not permit exile, and there is not a single Honduran who cannot live in Honduras. Are you going to Nicaragua?

Reporter: Yes.

Azcona: Convince Ortega to open up, to save Nicaragua, to save himself, to respect his Nicaraguan brothers, to speak to Arturo Cruz and the others, and not to think, not dream that he will be able to consolidate a Marxist revolution in Nicaragua. It is as if the Ukraine wanted to become a capitalist republic.

Reporter: Would it be according to the six points that you have set forth?

Azcona: The problem is that the United States is much more respectful and civilized than the Russians. In a similar case the Russians would have already invaded Nicaragua, like they invaded Czechoslovakia and Poland. They are much more civilized, empire for empire. I prefer the U.S. empire over the Russian.

Reporter: Here there is no awareness because the Soviet Union is not well known, while the United States is.

Azcona: We know because we saw what happened in Cuba, and we are seeing what is happening in Nicaragua. The country or government that neglects its citizens with its actions is not a good government. That is fascism. No one likes to live outside his of her country unless it has been a voluntary move.

Reporter: However, aren't there 1 million Salvadorans outside their country also?

Azcona: Yes, but that problem arose as a result of unjust structures. When the change came it was already too late. A very strong armed opposition had already been formed. However, there are not as many Salvadoran exiles as Nicaraguan exiles. There is a guerrilla force operating inside its borders.

Reporter: Are there more Salvadoran refugees?

Azcona: Yes. However, most of them can return to El Salvador without anything happening to them.

Reporter: Couldn't it be against the principle of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of a country to ask Nicaragua to change?

Azcona: No one is attempting to change Nicaragua. That is a hope that Honduras has. I can believe and think and want. However, I will not do it or demand that they do it. I would like Nicaragua to take the democratic path and I support the position of Nicaragua's political parties. Who can prevent my sympathies with various things? That is not intervention. I am certain Commander Ortega wants and would be very happy to see a revolutionary government like the one in Nicaragua establish itself in Honduras. This is also not intervention in Honduras' domestic affairs.

Reporter: Has the Nicaraguan president already said that he would like that to happen?

Azcona: Isn't that what his doctrine propounds? Whoever proclaims himself as Marxist-Leninist is saying that. What does Marxist-Leninism say? What is the main goal of that doctrine? The liberation of the people's? That is like Christians wanting everyone to be Christian.

Reporter: President Roberto Suazo Cordova upheld foreign policy positions that are very similar to yours. However, you fought against him. Why don't you set forth a position that is different?

Azcona: In domestic policy affairs I do. I am a democrat. You asked me a question. I was told that I was criticized because I did not get involved in my party's policies. I am not cut out to be a dictator. I respect people. I am not going to try to divide sectors in Honduras, nor will I attempt to sow division in my party. I will not intervene in other parties' affairs. I will respect the Constitution. If we agree on fortign policy it is because none of us are left-wingers. Therefore, we must naturally agree. My campaign was not based on criticism against Suazo's foreign policy.

Reporter: You defined yourself as being of the center-left?

Azcona: I do not know. I do not like to use the term right or left. I am a liberal who has very good principles that some might describe as leftist although we could never subordinate ourselves to the world interests for economic power, but we must struggle for the common good; there must be a just distribution of wealth. On the other hand, we defend the right to property, and that is a position of the right.

Reporter: What about within the spectrum between Christian Democrats and Social Democrats?

Azcona: Well, I would say that we are closer to the Social Democrats although here the Christian Democrats say there are of the left. I do not know because people are judged here by the terms and the situations.

Reporter: What could West Europe do or what would you like it to do for Honduras?

Azcona: I would like to tell them that here in this small country we are living in a real democracy, that we are learning to live in democracy, that the citizens' freedoms are respected here, that we are a good and noble people who want to live in peace, that we are not warmongerers or lackeys of the United States. However, they should understand that we are in Central America and without seeking it, we are in the zone of conflict. Even though they are thousands of kilometers away and much more powerful than we are, they have to choose sides and they have decided to be friends of the United States. With much more reason, we have to do the same.

Mitterrand has not sought to be friends with the Soviet Union. Neither did Felipe Gonzalez. He voted to remain in NATO. Not even the Greek prime minister, being a Socialist has eliminated the base of the Sixth Fleet. So then, why are they alarmed, and why do they make a great to-do if there are U.S. sailors in Greece, if there are U.S. pilots at the Torrejon base and the other bases in Spain, if there are U.S. soldiers in the FRG and all those countries are NATO members, and they have air missiles, why are they so self-righteous, that the boys of Nicaragua must be helped in a gesture, for one side, for a complex? [sentence as published]

Reporter: Then the difference is that in those countries there is no situation of imminent conflict with a neighboring country?

Azcona: There is no conflict? Isn't Berlin divided?

Reporter: There is another system there.

Azcona: Well, Nicaragua has another system also, or is it that we do not want to include Nicaragua in that? Do we want Somoza to return to Nicaragua? Do we want the achievements that they say they have given to the people -- they say they have carried out agrarian reform -- to be irreversible? No. We have agrarian reform here. Here we have very strong unions, very strong teachers' organizations, in one of which leftists are the leaders. We have student fronts, we have leftist fronts, and there is no problem.

Why must they put in uniform all Nicaraguans who must be in agreement with their beliefs? Why? Why do they have weapons? Why did they oust Somoza? They did not oust him. The Nicaraguan people ousted him. It was not them alone.

Reporter: You say you do not want a return to Somozism in Nicaragua?

Azcona: Of course not; I was anti-Somozist.

Reporter: But it is known that there is much Somozism among the contras. Do you believe the FDN can be an alternative?

Azcona: There is no need for there to be an alternative. It is sufficient that this regime opens up...and if they are the majority of the people, and they are going to win a free election, then they should go ahead; but they should rule within a constitution. That is the important part, no one should feel he is the owner of a country or a group.

Reporter: What if, in theory, you should have to channel your liberal, social democratic position concerning Nicaragua in a conflict with someone who said: I am a contra? [sentence as published]

Azcona: I am not saying I am a contra. What I am saying is that the Nicaraguan Government should open up; it has to respect freedom and honor what it promised at the OAS. It has not fulfilled any of the promises; it has no credibility. However, then the Germans, and the French, and the Italians say I am a dictator, or some one who sells out to the gringos, and Ortega is described as a redeemer. There is a very big difference. I would never harm a Honduran, I would rather leave; but they want to stay in power, regardless, because they are dogmatized [as published], they are not democratic. That is the difference. Then, it is said that Honduras does not have a good reputation abroad; a country that has no political prisoners and persecutes no one for his ideas, a country with full freedom of the press, a government that has high morals, a government with political morals. I really cannot understand that.

Reporter: No. I do not think the world thinks you are a dictator!

Azcona: No, but it is said I have sold out to the gringos, yet they say nothing of Mitterrand, or of Felipe Gonzalez. Didn't Felipe Gonzalez say during his campaign that they should vote no to NATO? Why, if he is a Socialist? What then? Does the Spanish Army carry out joint maneuvers with the U.S. Army?

Reporter: Perhaps because it is easier to listen to Ortega?

Azcona: Oh, there comes the European complex with the United States: We are always going to be against the United States, but the United States has never gone to Europe to defend a fascist system. It first went to oust the German kaiser that represented harshness and skill against Hitler. However, Stalin was able to call the United States when it was invaded by Germany. Yet, I cannot ask the United States to lend me some helicopters when Nicaraguans are entering my country.

Reporter: Are there a great deal of anti-Sandinist feelings?

Azcona: No, but I do something else. Stalin or Russia called on the United States to become involved in the war to defeat Germany and Austria, but I am not allowed to ask the United States to lend me two helicopters to dispatch a few soldiers to Honduran territory. That is a sin.

Reporter: Do you really think that, if it were not for the United States, Nicaragua would come over here?

Azcona: I don't know. What I do know is that the communist countries and worldwide Marxism would spread Marxism throughout the world through subversion if they could, or through indoctrination, or whatever.

Reporter: But that is combat by other means, not just with helicopters.

Azcona: One does not fight with helicopters? Then why does Nicaragua have helicopters?

Reporter: Why does Honduras need helicopters?

Azcona: To transport the Army to oust the Sandinists from the territory they were occupying in Honduras. We have not occupied Nicaraguan territory.

Reporter: Was the Honduran Army there?

Azcona: Of course. We took the Honduran Army there.

Reporter: Was there a clash with Honduran soldiers?

Azcona: There was. The thing is that the Nicaraguans fled. They left prisoners; they left their dead, and they fled. They are not going to make me flee, nor are they going to make me change my position. My position is clear, and I would like those Nicaraguan gentlemen to understand this and to act more flexibly and more intelligenty. Ortega can remain there for 2 years...he might win or share power, but he cannot deny others the right to also attain power. What those people want is to convert Nicaragua into a huge jail like Cuba. Of course, the Nicaraguans happily sign an agreement and look...let us patrol here, and let no one enter and later, with Costa Rica, and inside we will do what we want. [sentence as published] Is this morally right?

Reporter: One element of international law is that it obliges any state to prevent attacks on another state.

Azcona: I am not attacking Nicaragua.

Reporter: Yes, but this can also be done by omission.

Azcona: What do you mean, done by omission? The Honduran soldiers are not going to enter Nicaragua.

Reporter: I am referring to the contras.

Azcona: What do you want? Do you want me to spend millions upon millions here to guard their backs? Who is going to give me those millions to deploy 20,000 or 30,000 men? Should I spend the millions that I need for medicine, schools, and to pay teachers? Just to guard their rear? Hell! Let them guard their own backs.

Reporter: Is it an economic problem then?

Azcona: It is an overall problem. The problem is the Nicaraguans. Why do the contras exist? Why do the refugees exist? Because they are not satisfied with that government, and that is very clear, as was the case with Somoza. Why did they oust Somoza? Why did they disagree with Somoza? What about us? Is it our duty to guard their rear while they are doing as they please in Nicaragua? That is not my duty.

Reporter: There have been perhaps even worse situations of conflict on the Salvadoran border.

Azcona: Yes, but they did not involve ideology or territorial expansion. We are not going to neglect the problem with El Salvador. We know that we have to mark the border as soon as possible. If we look at it from the perspective of time, we are more concerned about the problem with El Salvador, because the Nicaraguan problem is of the moment, while the other problem will be permanent as long as the border issue remains unresolved. What we will always reject is the demand that Honduras guard Nicaragua's back. We have no obligation to do that.

NICARAGUA

FOREIGN MINISTRY CONDEMNS U.S. ATTACK ON LIBYA

PA151335 Managua International Service in Spanish 1302 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Communique issued by the Foreign Ministry in Managua on 14 April -- read by unidentified speaker]

[Text] The Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry, aware of the most recent premeditated military attacks by the U.S. Government against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, expresses its most vigorous condemnation of this new aggression that endangers world peace.

The U.S. Government, alleging that it is fighting terrorism, has launched this aggression, carrying out the most indiscriminate international terrorism by ordering the bombing of targets in populated areas of Tripoli.

Open recourse to the use of force which has characterized the Reagan administration's policy, today places the entire international community in a dangerous situation inasmuch as the aggression launched against Libya totally lacks justification and only finds explanation in the U.S. insistence in imposing its will on independent nations, acting outside the international law provisions and the mechanisms established for the peaceful solution of controversies.

The actions of the United States are absolutely unjustifiable in view that days earlier, Libya not only denied responsibility but furthermore condemned the acts used by the Reagan administration to justify its aggression. Moreover, no serious evidence of support for its actions and aggressions exists. Likewise, one can only describe as irresponsible the disregard for the appeals issued by various governments of the world calling for moderation and peaceful solutions to prevent the new escalation of military tensions that today has become a reality in the Mediterranean.

In light of this new act of aggression, Nicaragua, from its position as a nonaligned country and upon expressing its solidarity with the Libyan people, issues a call to the international community to carry out all the necessary efforts to demand from the U.S. Government behavior that is in line with the basic norms of international law.

Managua, 14 April 1986

Parties Repudiate Attack

PA151750 Managua Radio Noticias in Spanish 1255 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] Nicaragua's political sectors have begun to issue statements repudiating the savage U.S. attacks against Libya. Carlos Cuadra of the Marxist-Leninist Popular Action Party and Gustavo Tablada, secretary general of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party, emphatically repudiated the attack and said that it is time for the Nicaraguan people to close ranks.

Various Groups Comment

PA152120 Managua Radio Sandino in Spanish 1930 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] The Nicaraguan Committee of Solidarity with the Peoples, CNSP, strongly condemned the U.S. attack on Libya. Patricia Elvir, secretary general of the CNSP, said that the U.S. criminal attack on Libya is aimed at convincing the U.S. Congress of the effectiveness of President Reagan's methods, to obtain approval of the $100 million for the contras. The CNSP secretary general made a call to all the peoples of the world to show their solidarity with the Libyan and Nicaraguan people, who are currently targets of the U.S. state terrorism.

This morning, the Nicaraguan Association of Friendship with Socialist Countries, ANAPS, also condemned the U.S. air attack on Libya. ANAPS Secretary General Socorro Galan said that this U.S. attack on Libya will have grave consequences for the stability and security in the entire Middle East.

President Reagan's decision to attack Libya violates the World Powers Act, Freddy Balzan, executive secretary of the Anti-Imperialist Tribunal of Our America, TANA, said in a statement for this newscast.

[Begin Balzan recording] Last night and during the course of this morning, we have been in permanent contact with the international president of TANA, Dr Guillermo Torrielo, as well as with the TANA chapters in several Latin American countries. We also issued the following statement:

The premeditation, treachery, and cruelty that characterized the criminal U.S. bombing in an effort to assassinate the leader of the Libyan revolution, Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, and to destroy that sovereign country's military objectives, is an objectionable action and in the TANA's opinion should be severely sanctioned by the international community. TANA feels that U.S. President Ronald Reagan has trampled upon his own country's world powers act, which is not only another insult to the U.S. Congress, but it has virtually created a coup d'etat and [word indistinct] the United States has violated national laws, which places the world on the verge of a catastrophe.

It is certain that the criminal attack on the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is an unfortunate incident for international law carried out by the fascist gangs installed in the White House. It has destroyed humanity's hopes of solving conflicts among nations according to the dictates of the UN Charter.

The U.S. Government has irresponsibly tried to justify the military aggression against Libya as an effort to eliminate terrorism, when it is no longer a secret for any country in the world that the Reagan administration is the most authentic and fanatic example of the U.S. policy of state terrorism against truly free nations such as Nicaragua, Angola, and Vietnam, among many others. The U.S. genocidal attack on Libya came on the eve of congressional approval of $100 million to finance the criminal activities of the CIA mercenary groups, like the FDN, which are responsible for massive violations of human rights -- and this has been recognized internationally -- and whose main leaders are involved in drug trafficking and the illegal use of funds provided by U.S. taxpayers, as some U.S. Government institutions have reported.

Because of all of these reasons, the presidency and executive secretariat of TANA calls on all of the tribunal's chapters to reject the U.S. aggression against Libya, as well as its criminal plans against Nicaragua. [end recording]

Citizens Protest

PA161248 Managua Domestic Service in Spanish 1200 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] The people staged meetings and bonfires in different sections of Managua last night to repudiate the $100 million the Reagan administration is attempting to give the counterrevolution to cause more bloodshed in Nicaragua. The demonstrations by the residents of Managua were also to express solidarity with the sister people of Libya who are currently sustaining a most criminal aggression by the Reagan administration which has already produced many dead and wounded. The popular mobilizations took place in the neighborhoods of San Judas, Colonia Centro America, Ciudad Sandino, and others.

APPROVAL OF O'NEILL PROPOSAL CALLED 'MANEUVER'

PA160116 Managua Radio Sandino in Spanish 0000 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] We have a last minute report on the funds for maintaining the war on Nicaragua. The latest report, which we are receiving as a scoop from Washington, is that a few moments ago, the U.S. House of Representative agreed to include the $100 million that will be used for maintaining the war on Nicaragua in a budget package.

This is in line with a proposal made by Representative Thomas O'Neill. The proposal has been approved by the House of Representatives. This means that the U.S. Congress will continue discussing more funds to maintain the aggression against Nicaragua. Nothing has changed by approving this variant.

This has been just a congressional manuever to brush up with legality what is illegal: the discussion of more funds for the counterrevolutionaries. Meanwhile, it has been reported that the United States has implemented a new political maneuver in Central America by [words indistinct] the foreign minister of Panama that the United States is willing to cut off the aid to the mercenary bands if Nicaragua signs the peace act. The U.S. Government claims that it would then provide other kinds of aid to the counterrevolutionaries.

These are maneuvers that the U.S. Government is carrying out to counteract world public opinion opposed to the congressional discussions, which have been termed immoral and illegal. We repeat: A few moments ago the U.S. House of Representatives approved in Washington D.C. a proposal by House leader Thomas O'Neill to discuss the $100 million to be used for continuing the war on Nicaragua as part of a suplementary-aid package.

REPORTAGE ON U.S.-LIBYAN CLASH, COMMENTARY

U.S. Policy 'State Terrorism'

FL151206 Havana Radio Progreso Network in Spanish 1100 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Station commentary]

[Text] The U.S. Government's state terrorism policy has been clearly exemplified during the last few hours as U.S. war planes attacked the Libyan capital for the second time in less than 24 hours. Before dawn, the targets were heavily populated Tripoli neighborhoods where Yankee bombs have caused numerous deaths and injuries, including foreign residents and Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's relatives.

The Spanish news agency EFE, citing the Libyan news agency JANA, reported a few moments ago that during this morning's attacks, Swiss, French, and Iranian Embassies were damaged in the Libyan capital. The Algerian Press Agency, citing the Libyan national station, reported that Libyan antiaircraft defense is firmly confronting aggression and that numerous U.S. planes have been downed and their pilots executed by the people. Tripoli Radio called for a holy war against the United States and urged Algeria, Syria, Morocco, Tunisia, and Egypt to attack U.S. targets in the Mediterranean. Other Tripoli radio reports indicate that at least 20 U.S. planes had been downed by the Libyan antiaircraft defense.

It is estimated that during Monday's U.S. state terrorism operation against Libya, 33 bombers participated, and protected by darkness of the night dropped laser directed bombs and launched air-to-surface rockets against Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's home and two airports. Other planes that left the America and Coral Sea aircraft carriers did the same thing against the coastal city of Benghazi, located east of the Gulf of Sidra. The F-111 planes, left the U.S. bases in British territory with the approval of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's government. In the opinion of military experts, it is possible that U.S. satellites played a key role in the attack and that other U.S. military installations offered logistical support to the attack against the Libyan people.

2d U.S.Air Strike Reported

PA151632 Havana International Service in Spanish 1600 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] The U.S. CNN Television Network and other sources have reported that 3 hours after the attack carried out by U.S. planes against Libya on Tuesday, another air aggression took place against Tripoli, the Libyan capital. It was said that the first U.S. Air Force attack lasted approximately half an hour and concentrated on the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. Radio Tripoli has repeatedly reported that Libyan antiaircraft defense units downed three of the F-111 planes that took part in the aggression. Unconfirmed reports say that Libyan airspace has been closed to international air traffic.

Embassy in Tripoli Undamaged

FL151817 Havana Television Service in Spanish 1700 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] The Cuban Embassy in Tripoli has reported that all Cubans residing in Libya are in perfect condition. Communication established with the Cuban Embassy in Tripoli confirmed that the building was not damaged. Medical personnel residing in Libya as internationalists continue providing services. Construction workers and crew of the Moncada ship anchored in the port of Tripoli and Playa Larga and the Pamik ships in the port of Benghazi have not had any difficulties and are working normally.

Libyan Official: No Fear of U.S.

FL152054 Havana Radio Reloj Network in Spanish 2036 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] Muhammad 'Ali al-Ajili, secretary of the People's Committee of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah in Cuba, told Radio Reloj this afternoon that the Libyan people are not afraid of U.S. imperialist aggression.

In reference to the brutal Yankee attack, the Arab diplomat said Libya continues struggling for its independence, honor, and against the U.S. policy of terrorism.

Muhammad 'Ali al-Ajili denounced the Yankee's morning attack on civilian zones in Tripoli and Benghazi which caused casualties among Libyan citizens and foreigners.

I would like to take the opportunity given to us by Radio Reloj, added the Libyan diplomat, to demonstrate that we are not alone since we have the support of peace lovers and progressive governments.

Anti-Libyan Actions Reviewed

PA152358 Havana International Service in Spanish 2300 GMT 15 Apr 86

["Note" by Leonor Bravo]

[Text] From its onset, the Ronald Reagan government has accused Libya -- although without presenting proof -- of sponsoring all terrorist acts taking place in the world. To destabilize the transformation process led by Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the United States is increasing its anti-Libya campaign. In April and May 1980 the U.S. Government expelled two Libyan diplomats. And (?a year later) it closed the Tripoli embassy in Washington. In 1981, U.S. fighter planes fired their missiles at two Libyan planes and shot them down in the Gulf of Sidra, a sea and air space which Libya claims is part of its territory. Months later, the United States banned the importing of crude Libyan oil.

In March 1984, it decided to suspend its deliveries to the Libyan petrochemical complex at (Ras Lanof). In December 1985, Reagan charged that Tripoli had participated in two actions that took place at the Rome and Vienna airports. In January, after ordering U.S. citizens living in Libya to return to the United States, the White House froze Libya's assets in U.S. banks.

From January to February 1986, Washington conducted air and sea maneuvers at the Gulf of Sidra. On 24 March, U.S. planes attacked three boats and an antimissile coastal installation in that Arab country.

The escalation of anti-Libyan aggression reached its peak on Monday when U.S. bombers attacked Tripoli, worsening the situation in the region and imperiling world peace.

AALAPSO Condemns Attack

PA160253 Havana International Service in Spanish 2300 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] In Havana, the AALAPSO has described the U.S. military aggression against Libya as brutal and cold blooded.

Government Statement

FL160255 Havana Television Service in Spanish 0000 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Statement issued by the Government of Cuba, date not given -- read by unidentified reporter]

[Text] Statement by the Cuban Government. In a piratical action that again shows both its absolute contempt for the norms of international law and for peaceful coexistence between states and the absence of a minimum respect for the moral principles that should rule the conduct of all governments, President Reagan, the leader of state terrorism, yesterday launched a brutal attack against the Libyan people, making use of his most sophisticated military means. With his habitual cynicism and in an outrageous attempt to justify it, the top American spokesman affirmed that the action was directed against military objectives. Their lack of truthfulness was revealed when it was shown that the Yankee attacks affected civilian installations in Tripoli, in which foreign citizens reside.

U.S. television has made it possible to view the scope of aggression against civilian buildings. Libyan sources have confirmed that the residence of the chief of the Libyan revolution, Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, was one of the objectives of that insane aggression. When he informed international public opinion, boasting of his actions and asserting they will be repeated if the United States considers it necessary, President Reagan invoked Article 51 of the UN Charter. Nothing could be more insulting to the international community than this jeering, not only at the spirit but at the letter of the Charter, of which Article 51 explicitly consecrates the right of legitimate individual or collective defense in case of armed attack against a member of the United Nations.

The unequivocal absence of any military aggression against the United States makes sterile all Reagan's attempts to find judicial support for his sinister aggression. Thus it is explicable that the White House has found it impossible to obtain the support of its NATO allies, who not only repudiated his action but also prohibited the aggressor Yankee aircraft from flying over their territories, forcing the United States Air Force in this way to fly an unexpected route and refuel its aircraft in flight.

To British shame, only the government of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher continued showing its unconditional support of Washington, returning to the Reagan government the aid Britain received when, betraying its pledges to the so-called TIAR [Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty], the United States supported the Malvinas Island adventure, distinguished by the same treachery and identical brutality. Although yesterday's intolerable action was not needed to confirm it, with this action Reagan has ratified his evident decision to convert himself into the promoter of the worst state terrorism, manifested in his support of the counterrevolutionary Somozist bands in Nicaragua and in his additional demand for $100 million in arms for these bands and the abolition of the Clark Amendment, with the declared intention of using the counterrevolutionary bands of Jonas Savimbi to further U.S. policy in southern Africa, which Washington manipulates against the Angolan revolution. The U.S. President, who has not hesitated in declaring himself the strategic ally of Israel and in ratifying Israel's continuous attacks against Arab nations, presents himself to the U.S. public as protector of his supposedly endangered security.

His avalanche of propaganda may be capable of winning for him the temporary support of the deceived U.S. people. But in the long run, truth will win out, and Reagan will once again be unmasked as the representative of his policy of military supremacy, force, and diktat [preceding word in English] which, if it does not lead as dramatically as appears to be possible to a catastrophe that would affect the entire world, will make him pass into history among the worst representatives of the big stick policy and barbarity.

The response of the international community shows its rejection of Reagan's decision to disregard all civilized mechanisms, proclaiming himself judge and jury of international law, which he does not respect.

A few hours before his despicable attack, the EEC had requested a political and diplomatic solution for the Mediterranean. But Reagan, the protector of counterrevolutionary terrorists accuses other states of terrorist acts and, like his kin in the Ku Klux Klan of the South, gives himself the right to place the blame arbitrarily and unilaterally, and hand out punishments that not even the UN Security Council would order.

Once again, this policy toward Libya is in contrast with his attitude in cases of proven criminality such as the crimes the racist regime of South Africa commits, which crimes have merited the condemnation of the United Nations.

The Nonaligned Movement, representing all underdeveloped countries that belong to the movement, have repudiated this unheard-of act and have demanded that the United States be condemned by the UN Security Council. All the world's nations that aspire to true peace and solid international security should support this action. The Government of the Republic of Cuba, by condemning with all its energy the aggression of the Reagan administration against Libya, expresses its dedicated solidarity with the Libyan people and their leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, and salutes the firmness they have shown in confronting the savagery of the U.S. leaders. The attitude of meting out justice oneself, which is incredible at this stage of human development, will only provoke greater confrontations and more bloodshed.

Today, 25 years after the bombing of the Cuban airports prior to the invasion of the Bay of Pigs, Cuba recalls that the lesson of that first defeat of imperialism in Latin America is that no one, no matter now powerful, can turn back the course of history.

3d U.S. Attack Noted

FL160418 Havana Television Service in Spanish 0000 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] The most recent reports with regard to Libya say that tonight the U.S. Air Force launched a third attack against the North African country, according to the correspondent in Tripoli of the Yugoslav TANJUG Agency. According to the source, this third attack lasted only 2 minutes but was very severe and occured only 20 minutes after the second attack.

The Libyan radio, in referring to this new attack against the capital of this Arab country, does not specify which objectives were attacked by the U.S. Planes. Other sources said that the Military-Naval Academy, which had already been attacked this morning, was again attacked today. During the first U.S. attack on Tripoli, an adopted daughter of Libyan leader Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi was killed, according to medical reports from that Arabic country. Another two of Al-Qadhdhafi's sons were seriously injured and his remaining five sons were wounded.